

Attorney Docket #10010261

**EXAMINER'S REMARKS**

Figure 3 was objected to because it was not labeled with the words "Prior Art".

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter.

Claims 1-8 and 13-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 4,647,771 to Kato (hereinafter, Kato). Claims 9-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by USPN 4,807,166 to Zalenski (hereinafter, Zalenski).

Claims 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 remain in this application. Claims 1, 9, 13, and 19 have been amended.

***A. Drawings***

Figure 3 was objected to because it was not labeled with the words "Prior Art". As illustrated in the attached red-line drawings, the words "Prior Art" have now been added to Figure 3.

No new matter has been introduced with any of these amendments. A new set of formal drawings will be submitted upon notice of allowance of this application. The objection to the drawings is believed to be overcome.

***B. Specification***

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for claim 19.

Claim 19 has been amended to depend from claim 17, rather than claim 18. No new matter has been introduced with this amendment. The objection to the specification is believed to be overcome.

Attorney Docket #10010261

***C. Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b) - claims 1-17*****The present invention is distinct over Kato**

Claims 1-8 and 13-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 4,647,771 to Kato.

Kato teaches a mousepad with reflective lines running in the X- and Y-axis directions. The optical mouse determines the speed and direction of its movement by counting the number of lines that pass by (column 1, lines 64-68). It is crucial that these reflective regions are patterned into gridlines; otherwise, the optical mouse will not work. Although Figure 10 shows circular dots with high reflectivity, these dots must be confined within the shape of a line 7X for the mousepad to work properly.

In distinct contrast to the prior art, the reflective regions of the present invention do not have to have any definite pattern (Page 5, paragraph 20; Figures 1 and 7). The operation of the optical mouse is not dependent upon the arrangement of the reflective regions. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to include this patentable feature. Both claims now recite a reflective set of first regions that are indiscriminately located amidst the second regions. Claims 1 and 13 are believed to be patentable. Dependent claims 2-8 and 14-17 are believed to be allowable, based on the allowability of independent claims 1 and 13.

**The present invention is distinct over Zalenski**

Claims 9-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by USPN 4,807,166 to Zalenski.

Zalenski teaches a method for calibrating an optical mouse used with a mousepad. The mousepad must be printed with a repetitive pattern of contrasting colors, because the optical mouse determines its motion by detecting the number of times the intensity of light reflected off of the mousepad crosses a threshold intensity level. Figures 3A and 3B illustrates possible patterns for the mousepad. Each pattern is repeated to form a grid-like structure.

In distinct contrast to the prior art, the contrasting regions of the present invention do not have to have any definite pattern (Page 5, paragraph 20; Figures 1 and 7). The operation of the optical mouse is not dependent upon the arrangement of the contrasting

Attorney Docket #10010261

regions. Claim 9 has been amended to include this patentable feature. It now recites a first group of regions, having a first reflectance, which are indiscriminately located amidst a second group of regions with a second reflectance. Claim 9 is believed to be patentable. Dependent claims 10-13 are believed to be allowable, based on the allowability of independent claim 9.

No new matter has been introduced with this amendment. The rejections to claims 1-17 are believed to be overcome.

***D. Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) - claims 18 and 19***

Claims 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato. Independent claim 13, from which claims 18 and 19 depend, has been amended as discussed in subsection C, and is now believed to be patentable. Dependent claims 18 and 19 are also believed to be allowable, based on the allowability of claim 13.

No new matter has been introduced with this amendment. The rejections to claims 18 and 19 are believed to be overcome.

Attorney Docket #10010261

**CONCLUSION**

If the Examiner has any further questions or would like to discuss this application in more detail, he is invited to call the Applicant's agent at the telephone number given below. The Applicant respectfully suggests that the claims presently in the application are distinct over the prior art and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant solicits favorable action.

Respectfully submitted,  
Robert Arthur Black



Judy Liao Shie

Patent Reg. No. 50,305

December 12, 2002  
Agilent Technologies  
Intellectual Properties Administration  
Legal Department, M/S DL-429  
815 SW 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Loveland, CO 80537  
(408) 345-8920

FAX RECEIVED

DEC 12 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800